DA
508
P3B77

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.
Chap. DA 508
Shelf P3B77
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

WHAT W. H. BURR

HAS TO SAY IN DEFENCE OF THE

LIBERTY LOVING THOMAS PAINE.

THE INTERGRITY OF JUNIUS.

WAS PAINE JUNIUS?

Another Weak and Painful Performance!

SOME MORE MISTAKES

BLUNDERING AND MUD-SLINGING.

Times Office, Seymour, April 10th.

DA 508
.P3B77

The Integrity of Junius.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 18, '81.

Forty years ago after Junius concluded his work, a new edition of his letter was published, including for the first time 63 private letters to his publisher Woodfall, 10 private letters to John Wilkes, and 101 so-called miscellaneous letters of Junius under various signatures. A few of the private letters and most of the miscellaneous ones are certainly spurious. We can judge of their authenticity now just as well as the editor could in 1812. Fifty-nine or sixty of the private letters are dated conjecturally by the editor, and many of the miscellaneous letters rest their sole claim on a coincidence between the dates of publication and the dates affixed to one or the other of the private letters to H. S. Woodfall (London Atheneum, 1852.)

One year after the publication of those miscellaneous letters, John Taylor, one of the proprietors of the London Magazine, thought he discovered that Philip Francis was Junius, and in 1816 he published a book attempting to prove it. Whether anybody before him had ever suspected Francis, I never heard; but Taylor certainly was the first who attempted to establish the identity, and he did it almost entirely on those unauthenticated miscellaneous letters, beginnig with April 1767, when Francis was a clerk in the war office, only 26 years of age.

One of the arguments in favor of Francis is, that "in the month of January, 1772, the king remarked to a friend in confidence, 'Junius is known and will write no more.' "Such," says the writer, Dr. Goodrich, "proved to be the fact. His last performance was dated January 21, 1772. * * * Within a FEW MONTHS Sir Philip Francis was appointed to one of the higest stations of profit and trust in India." Now the fact was, that Francis, then a mere clerk, 31 years of age, was suddenly turned out of office in March following, and was not appointed to the office of profit and trust in India until a year and a half afterward. But if that young war clerk was Junius, then there is not among the dregs of human nature a character so false and vile as his: and Colonel Ingersoll is right in calling him "a coward, a calumniator and a sneak." But I stand ready to vindicate the stern integrity of Junius; and in order to show how he stood in the estimation of unbiased critics before Philip Francis was suspected to be Junius, I submit a few extracts from the preliminary essay in Woodfall's edition, written and published in 1812.

"In reality Junius, though a severe satirist, was not in his general temper a malevolent writer nor an ungenerous man. No one has ever been more ready to admit teh brilliant talents of Sir William Blackstone than himself, or to apply to his commetaries for legal information, while reprobating his conduct in the unconstitutional expulsion of Mr. Wilkes from the house of commons."

"Yet there were statesmen whom he believed to be truly honest and upright, and for whom he felt a personal as well as a political reverence; and it is no small proof of the keenness of his penetration that the characters whom he then

singled out from the common mass of pretenders to genuine patriotism have been ever since growing in the public estimation, and are now justly looked back to as the pillars and bulwarks of the English constitution."

"Vaughan himself had so high an opinion of our author's integrity, though a total stranger to him, that he entrusted him with his private papers upon the subject in question, which Junius in return took care to employ to Vaughan's advantage."

"Whether the writer of these letters had any other and less worthy object in view than that he uniformly avowed, namely: a desire to subserve the best political interests of his country, it is impossible to ascertain with precision. It is unquestionably no common occurrence in history to behold a man thus steadily, and almost incessantly, for five years volunteering his services in the cause of the people, amidst abuse and slander from every party, exposed to universal resentment, unknown, and not daring to be known, without having any personal object to acquire, any sinster motive of individual aggrandisement or reward. Yet nothing either in the public or private letters affords us the remotest hint that he was thus actuated. Throughout the whole, from first to last, in the midst of all his warmth and rancour, his argument and his declamation, his appeals to the public and his notes to his confidential friend, he seems to have been influenced by the stimulus of sound and genuine patriotism alone. With this he commenced his career, and with this he retired from the field of action, retaining at least a twelve-month afterwards, (see private letter, January 19, 1773), the latest period in which we are able to catch a glimpse of him, the same political sentiments he had professed on his first appearance before the world, and still ready to renew his efforts the moment he could perceive that they had a chance of being attended with benefit. Under these circumstances, therefore, however difficult it may be to acquit him altogether of personal considerations, it is still more difficult, and must be altogether unjust, ungenerous and illogical to suspect his integrity."

The justice and candor of this writer is completely established by the discovery that Paine was Junius. "If I have anywhere expressed myself over-warmly," says Paine, "'tis from a fixed, immovable hatred I have and ever had to cruel men and cruel measures."—Crisis, No. 2, 1777. "I speak an open disinterested language, dictated by no passion but that of humanity. To me, who have not only refused offices because I thought them improper, but have declined rewards I might with reputation have accepted, it is no wonder that meanness and imposition appear disgusting. Independence is my happiness, and I view things as they are, without regard to place and person; my country is the world and my religion is to do good."—Rights of Man, 1792. "In a great affair, where the happiness of man is at stake, I love to work for nothing."—1802. "I take neither copyright nor profit from anything I publish."—1807. "I have

lived an honest and useful like to mankind; my time has been spent in doing good, and I die in perfect composure and resignation to the will of my Creator God."—Will, 1809. W. H. BURR.

For the Seymour Times.

WAS PAINE JUNIUS?

Another Weak and Painful Performance.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 23, '81.

The principal points presented by Mr. Underwood, in his various articles on the Junius question and the answers thereto, are as follows:

1. "Paine says, the cause of America made me an author."

Answer: That cause crops out from first to last in the Junius letters.

2. "Paine did not possess and was not in a situation to obtain the knowledge of persons and transactions necessary to enable him to write those letters."

Answer: Mr. Parton says Junius "was not in the circle of the well-informed;" and again, "Junius WAS nothing and KNEW nothing." The private letters to John Wilkes confirm the obscure position of Junius; so does his private letter to Lord Chatham, quite recently brought to light. Paine was a life-long worker in secret.

3. "The style of Junius is more studied and polished than that of Paine."

Answer: The earlier work of an artist always requires most labor and care. Paine's later writings are far less polished than his earlier ones. Speaking of the style of Junius and of "Common Sense," Prof. Denslow, after arguing their identity, says: "We have no writer in America to this day so practiced in the handling of pure and elegant English, or that could have written either of the chapters of "Common Sense?" Again, in regard to Paine's scathing letter to General Washington, in 1796, the Prof. says: "it is so identical in style with portions of Junius that we cite parallel passages for comparison, though the unhesitating conviction that Paine wrote Junius will better result from the use of hundreds of passages than of two or three."

4. "Paine would have had no reason to conceal the authorship during the last thirty years of his life."

Answer: Had he broken his solemn and deliberate promise, "I am the sole depository of my own secret and it shall perish with me," he would have been worse than "a coward and a sneak."

5. "Did the poor exciseman write this? 'For the matter of assistance, be assured, that if a question should arise upon any writings of mine, you shall not want it. [YOU SEE HOW THINGS GO, AND I FEAR MY ASSISTANCE WOULD NOT AVAIL YOU MUCH. * * * MY OWN WORKS YOU SHALL CONSTANTLY HAVE, AND] in point of money be assured you shall never suffer."

Answer: Why did Mr. U. omit the above words in brackets and insert only a semicolon between the other two parts of the quotation? Did he garble the passage himself, or borrow it from another garbler? Further quotations which I made from the private letters show conclusively that all the assistance Junius rendered or could render, was the profits on his own works, which were more than Woodfall wished to accept.

6. "January 1772 the king remarked to a friend, Junius is known and will write no more." * * * NOT LONG AFTERWARDS Francis was appointed to a position of profit and trust."

Answer: It was a year and a half before Francis was appointed, and if he was Junius he continued, as is claimed for Francis, to write under the signature of "Veteran" nearly three months longer, and under other signatures still another month. "Veteran's" fifth letter dated March 23, announced that Mr. Francis had been expelled from office by Lord Barrington; then follow three more letters under other signatures continuing the assault on Barrington, the last being dated May 12, 1772.

7. "Lord Brougham wrote while Francis was alive; yet the essay called out no contradiction from Francis."

Answer: Sir Philip Francis wrote to the editor of the monthly magazine, July 1813: "Sir:—The great civility of your letter induces me to answer it, which, with reference merely to its subject matter, I should have declined. Whether you will assist in giving currency to a

SILLY MALIGNANT FALSEHOOD, is a question for your own discretion. To me it is a matter of perfect indifference."

8. "Mr. Burr utterly fails to reconcile Junius' support of monarchy, the right to tax the American colonies, etc., with Paine's known hatred of the monarchical form of government, and his denunciations of Britain's claims on the colonies."

Answer: I proved by Paine's own words that he was a monarchist until one year after Junius ceased to write. And though it is true that Junius maintained the "speculative right" to tax the colonies, what rational man will dispute that right? But to show that Paine never disputed it, I quote from Prof. Denslow: "It is also noticeable how small a figure the question of taxation cuts in the declaration; and it will be remembered that Junius at first advocated the justice of taxing America, as Paine, being an exciseman, would naturally have done, for an exciseman naturally adheres to a tax. Moreover, Paine, out of contempt for money, would have looked upon rebellion against a tax as mean."

9. "The miscellaneous letters are death to the Paine theory. The genuineness of these letters is admitted, as Mr. Burr says, by Prof. Denslow."

Answer: If those unauthenticated letters are death to the Paine theory, how about the Francis theory? Says the Professor in his second essay: "Sackville is also, one of the few claimants of the honors who could have been present as Junius says he was, at the burning of Busembaum, Suarez, Molena and a score of other Jesuitical books in Paris, at the hands of the common hangman, in 1714. It is not claimed that Philip Francis could then have been in Paris." Why the professor should thus have befogged the question while seemingly maintaining that Paine had at least a hand in the writing of the letters, I cannot imagine. The letter he refers to was signed "Bifrons," and dated April 23, 1868. Will the Franciscans claim that as genuine?

10. "Although Mr. Burr has fallen into an error, 'misled' as he says 'by the reviewer of the Nation,' I shall neither call him a 'blunderer' nor devote half a column to comments on this mistake."

Answer: How very considerate! Did I make a mistake? But even if I and not the reviewer did, of what importance was it? The space I have occupied in this discussion is much less than that taken by my opponent, and if I devoted half a column to a mistake of his it was a very important one—nay, a vital one; and his tardy answer to it was, that he wrote or intended to write inconclusive for conclusive.

11. "In his desperation to make a point, Mr. Burr is ready to admit for the moment that Paine slandered Silas Deane."

Answer: I neither admitted nor denied it. I referred to it as one of Paine's anonymous assaults. Mr. U. replied by saying that the charges were true, as Mr. Burr knew. To that I replied that I did not know it, and that a very intelligent old freethinker who had investigated the matter told me that Deane was innocent. I also referred to other anonymous assaults by Paine, as "Casca." And I will now add that "Common Sense" which denounced "the royal brute of Great Britain" was published anonymously; and so also were the 16 numbers of the "Crisis," from 1777 to 1783, in which Lord Howe and others were assailed in the style of Junius.

12. "Mr. Burr's censorious spirit and offensive personalties do not strengthen his position. I will not bandy epithets with him."

Answer: At the outset of this discussion Mr. U. said: "Junius Unmasked is in my opinion a weak performance. * * * And the articles from the pen of Mr. Burr, have not I think, given one fact that goes to show that Paine wrote those letters." That was the first personality; and what did it imply but that I am either a fool, a lunatic or a knave?

13. "I am glad to know that Mr. Burr is not the author [of "J. U.,"] * * * for it reflects no credit on the judgment or judicial candor of its author, who got his wild theory, I understand, from the spirit world," etc.

Answer: There is not a word about spiritualism in the book, and I stated in

the Investigator and the two leading spiritual papers in January, 1872, that its author assured me he was not a spiritualist. Again, I made a similar statement in the Times, Sept. 11, 1880, in reply to an anonymous writer, who, nevertheless, dogmatically asserted that the author was a spiritualist. And recently Mr. U. has repeated the same assertion in the Investigator, after I had once more reiterated my former statement. Am I thus to be put in the attitude of a falsifier? If the author of J. U. is, or ever was, a spiritualist, I never heard of it except through these two assailants.

14. "Jefferson was a liar; John Adams was a 'meaner' liar. Denslow is a calumniator, * * * and his [Mr. Burr's] assailants are knaves or ignoramusus."

Answer: The lie that Jefferson, in his dotage, told, I insist was nothing like as mean as that of John Adams when he claimed that Jefferson had stolen his ideas from him to put into the declaration. As to Prof. Denslow, I have proved that he calumniated Paine in several instances. And I have called one assailant who, among other blunders, attributed to Benjamin Franklin what his grandson said, an ignoramus. But I have not called any adversary a knave. I prefer to state and prove facts with as little comment as possible.

15. "It is some consolation to know that ONE great and honest man stands erect amid the moral ruins of humanity, and that man is ———"

Answer: Thank you, Mr. Underwood, for refraining from offensive personalities, from bandying epithets, and for your courtesy in general.

16. "The letter of Feb. 28," says Mr. U., containing his correction, inconclusive for conclusive, "was delayed at the Times office owing to the loss of two of the sheets," &c.

Answer: Was the first sheet lost beginning with the important correction? That, anyhow, should have been inserted at once. But in the next issue my second notice of the untenable position appeared, and another week passed with no correction; but in the fourth week, March 19, appeared two letters from Mr. U., one dated Feb. 28, and the other March 8, both making the correction, and the latter censuring me for "taking advantage of this error in two numbers of the Times BEFORE IT WAS POSSIBLE FOR HIM TO CORRECT IT!" How could I suspect such an error when it is apparent to everybody who has read Prof. Denslow's two essays, (and Mr. U. said "essay" in the singular), that the first is "conclusive" and the second "inconclusive" on the Junsus question? Furthermore, Mr. U's letter of March 8, explains his failure to reply quickly to my articles by the fact that the Times does not reach him as early as it does me. Nothing there about the loss of sheets—nothing till now.

17. "The little error into which I fell, MISLED I REPEAT BY MR. BURR, was corrected the moment I discovered it."

Answer: It was I that discovered and exposed it, and when Mr. U. saw my exposure in the T. S. he hastened to correct it, but was too late for his article in the Investigator. And I repeat, it is disingenuous to charge me with misleading him, when in the first instance I neither indorsed nor denied the statement so positively made that Benjamin Franklin said Jefferson drafted the declaration. Do such "offensive personalities" strengthen Mr. U's position?

THE RANK AND FORTUNE OF JUNIUS.

18. "That Paine wrote of his rank and fortune to hoodwink Woodfall is a mere assumption."

Answer: Did not Junius have to hoodwink everybody? In explanation of one of his substerfuges he says: "The auxiliary part of PHILO JUNIUS was indispensably necessary. * * * The fraud was innocent, and I always intended to explain it." Nor did Junius categorically claim to be a man of rank and fortune; the expression was equivocal and susceptible of an irironical interpretation. But what rank and fortune had Francis at the age of 28? And what kind of a fellow was he to write to his intimate friend and schoolmate: "I doubt very much whether I shall ever have the pleasure of knowing you?" Or this, two years later: "I am persuaded you are too honest a man to contribute in any way to my destruction. Act honorably by me and at a proper time you shall know me." But a proper time never come, and two or three months

later Junius declared that his secret should perish with him.

19. In answer to Mr. U's two columns of testimonials in favor of the Franciscan theory, and against Paine, I say: How would he like to decide the question of plenary inspiration by the weight of authority? Or even the doctrine of evolution, which Lamark so ably maintained fifty years before Darwin, and yet never made an impression on the scientists of his day? Or how would he like to decide the question of the revolution of the sun around the earth by a vote of eminent scholars during the life-time of Galilleo? There are many John Jaspers even now among the ignorant who believe that "the sun do move." And there are many scholars who are as yet unwilling to admit the demonstration that Paine was Junius. Mr. U. has arrayed a score of them in the columns of the Times. If any one of these savants will adduce a single reason against the identity of Paine as Junius, which I cannot answer as readily as I have answered all those hitherto presented, then let the undersigned be everlastingly damned to an orthodox hell! W. H. BURR.

For the Seymour Times.

Some More Mistakes.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 16, '81.

As Mrs. Chappellsmith says she is "not CERTAIN that Burr cites accurately" her letter of Dec. 31, 1874, Burr will now send Chappellsmith the original.

Chappellsmith further says: "I told Burr * * * that I thought that known facts made against the probability" that Paine was Junius. What she did say was this:

"I think that Paine's position in life and vocations could not have enabled him to have the familiarity with the personages criticized in the Junius letters, which the writer of those letters appears to have had, and the style of those letters indicates a greater experience in writing than Paine could have had in 1769."

The first of these objections te the only "reasonable" one raised by Prof. Denslow. It was repeatsd by Col. Ingersoll, but refuted not only by James Parton, but by the private letters of Junius, especially those written to John Wilkes, and lastly by one written to Lord Chatham. On the presentation of these evidences by me, Prof. Denslow gave up his only "reasonable objection," but it was afterwards again repeated substantially by Mr. Underwood.

In regard to experience in writing, it is certain that Junius wrote for Woodfall's paper nearly two years before his first essay as Junius. And when the first of those earlier letters appeared, Paine was 30 years of age, while Philip Francis was only 26.

If Paine was without experience as a writer in 1776, how came he to produce so remarkable a work as "Common Sense?" Of this performance, Prof. Denslow says:

"In the very first sentences of "Common Sense," all the polished sarcasm, fine rhetorical antithesis, and lofty blending of philosophic calmness, with contemptuous disdain for his adversaries, all the tart crisp, pugnacious simplicity, and hard clearness of statement; in a word, every element of literary force, political depth, and range of thought which distinguish Junius, reappear.

Again says Prof. D., after quoting the paragraph about the slave trade in the original draft of the declaration of independence. "The English language possesses no clause more elaborate in its rhetoric, and few so false in fact."

The alleged falsehoods, by the

way, which Prof. D. attempts to point out in the declaration are not falsehoods at all. That George III had "prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or restrain this execrable commerce" in men, was the subject of complaint in 1774, and in October of that year, the colonial congress unanimously adopted a declaration, which they sent to the king, containing among other things this article:

"That we will neither import nor purchase any slave imported after the first day of December next, after which time we will wholly discontinue the slave trade."

And in August of the same year, Jefferson himself drew up a resolution of instructions to the deputies when assembled in congress, in which he said that the repeated attempts to stop the slave trade had "been hitherto defeated by his majesty's negative."

Again Prof. D. says the declaration of 1776 contains such false counts as "abolishing the free system of English laws in Canada," and he quotes that blundering historian, Bancraft, to prove it false. Now the colonial declaration of Oct. 20, 1774, above referred to, mentions, among other offensive acts of parliament, "an act extending the province of Quebec, so as to border on the western frontiers of colonies, establishing an arbitrary government therein and discouraging the settlement of British subjects in that wide extended country," &c. The whole clause of 1774, is reproduced quite literally in the declaration of 1776. If, therefore, these two complaints were "false, in fact," as Prof. D. asserts, they were repeatedly made and attested by every colonial congressman of 1774, and 1776.

Another absurd error of Prof. Denslow's is the dogmatic denial of the self-evident truth that all men are created equal. Will he, or anybody else, deny that I have not an equal right with himself to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?" That is exactly the meaning and the expression of the declaration, and it is folly to deny so self-evident a truth.

W. H. B.

For the Seymour Times.

Blundering and Mud-slinging.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 30, 1881.

Mr. Underwood is unlucky, to say the least, in regard to the discovery of his mistakes. I always happen to get a little ahead of him. He did not discover that he "wrote or intended to write inconclusive for conclusive" until I exposed the fallacy of his position. He did not discover the error about Franklin, which he so eagerly embraced to support the claim of Jefferson's authorship of the declaration of independence, until I had looked up the authority and detected the blunder. And then he said the error was corrected the moment he discovered it! As if he and not I found it out.

And now again, writing at Seymour, Ind., April 26, the very day when I (and probably he) received the Investigator containing my reiterated exposure of another persistent error of his, namely, that the author of J. U., is or was a spiritualist, he makes a half-way correction and apology for that.

He also takes great pains to hunt up and reproduce what I had al-

ready given in the Times two weeks before, about the alleged spiritual origin of the discovery that Paine was Junius. But lo! he leaves out from the quotation what proves him to be a falsifier. He asserts that "the conviction that Paine was Junius was not the result of acquaintance with the subject, based upon study." I now quote a single sentence from the hiatus of Mr. U's partial quotation: "In producing this work he [the author of J. U.] has made a long and laborious research." And a little further on I say: "The next inquiry was one involving great literary labor and keen criticism. A thorough analysis of Paine's political writings had to be made, as well as of the letters of Junius. At every step the proof accumulated." In short, more than two thirds of my article of January 21, 1872 is made up of proofs, taken from the book itself, that Paine wrote the letters of Junius and the declaration of independence. But despite all this Mr. U. insinuates that I have not told the whole truth and audaciously affirms that the "conviction that Paine was Junius was NOT the result of acquaintance with the subject, based upon study!"

Mr. Underwood with his feet fast in Franciscan mire has been throwing mud at Junius and his champions. And now "Don Quixote" Coleman, a spiritualistic knight has come to the help of the materialistic chieftain. But alas, D. Q. C. is also stuck fast in the mire and can't sling much mud. Won't somebody with longer legs and stouter arms kindly lift these two slingers out of the slough?

W. H. B.

NOW READY.

THE

ORIGIN OF MAN;

OR THE

EARLY REFORMS.

A TALE OF TAILS.

BY

J. R. MONROE, M. D.,

Editor of the Seymour (Ind.) Times.

Sixty pages, handsomely printed. Price in paper 60 cents. Three cent stamps may be remitted.

ALL FOR 10 CENTS.

THE PICTURE OF THE

BIBLE GOD,

with some chapters of nice reading for christians and heathens. Just issued from the Seymour Times publication office.

The contemplation of this beautiful picture cannot fail to inspire devotion and love of god in the minds of all beholders. Ten cents by mail. Discount to the trade. Address, J. R. MONROE,
April 5, 103. Seymour Indiana.

DR. MONROE'S volume of Dramas and Poems—a beautifully printed and bound volume of 190 pages—a few copies left. Price, by mail, $1.60.

DR. MONROE'S Death of King David. A short "pome"—price 5 cents. Feb 28-tf

State Secularization.

Address of the Committee—Underwood, Denslow and Spencer—to the people of the United States Price, 5 cents. Address, J. R. MONROE,
Jan. 8,'81.-tf. Seymour, Ind.

GAWKY JIM, a thrilling Yankee story wherein the weak confounds the mighty, by Rev. Theologicus, D.D. In neat pamphlet form, price 10 cents, 12 copies 75 cents. Address, Dr. J. R. Monroe, Seymour, Ind.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 020 661 517 5